'WHY VEGETARIAN?'

A REPLY TO CRITICS

I AWAITED the appearance of the May number of this Review hoping to meet in its pages a serious, carefully reasoned reply to my article entitled 'Why "Vegetarian"?' in the number for April. In this hope I have been disappointed. In default, however, numerous batches of 'cuttings' containing comments thereon have arrived from the agency; among them some from the authorised Vegetarian Press, and many from members of the society in various provincial journals. I venture, therefore, to ask permission to devote a few pages of reply to these criticisms, seeing that they all reproduce very much the same statements, and can be treated under two or three heads.

I may first say that the main object I had in view in publishing the article has been satisfactorily attained—namely, to ensure henceforth the cessation of reiterated public statements that I was a supporter of vegetarianism either in theory or practice, or that I approved of flesh abstaining as a dietetic habit for man. To a brief list of illustrious authorities repeatedly cited by the Vegetarian Press as asserting that animal food is unnecessary for man's diet—Cuvier, Owen, Darwin, Sir B. Richardson, and others—my own unworthy name had been added; and of these I happen to remain the sole survivor. By what authority the three first-named are regarded as advocates of a vegetarian diet I am at a loss to understand. Professor Owen for several years was well known to myself; I have not the faintest recollection of any expression of his favouring vegetarian views, and certainly met with no sign at his table of any practice indicating a leaning thereto. Some misapprehension may have arisen in respect of passages in his writings which have escaped my notice. But if his written language, or that of Cuvier, Owen, or Darwin, has been treated on the system pursued towards my own, I am not surprised at any inferences which may have been drawn from them. For I may say briefly, but emphatically, that in the many criticisms before me, I find in only two or three any reply to the argument of my paper; but instead merely the well-worn reproductions of a few isolated passages from my writings, carefully separated from their context, and thus seriously misrepresenting my real views. It was his that made it impossible for me to remain silent, and gave rise to

the first paper. What I felt to be a very unpleasant duty was forced upon me, and the manner in which it has been received by those whom I had always regarded in the light of old friends, seeing that we had certain aims very much in common, has made it still more unpleasant. In illustration of this and in defence of my own position, it will suffice to deal with a single quotation, as it was the first which arrested my attention, and it is a sample of others which have been made in the numerous authorised issues of vegetarian opinion—a striking specimen of the ingenuity by which an author may be misunderstood, and I do not desire to assert wilfully misrepresented, by those who, having pronounced views of a given question, can find the support for them and for no other in the work of an author whose name they desire to advertise as sustaining them. I am compelled, however, to add that the original adapter or adapters of the quotation in question can only avoid the gravamen of misrepresentation by admitting the imputation of serious mental defect. Permit me to say I would gladly have let these inaccurate statements pass unnoticed had they not been circulated with assiduity by a very active press in all directions, and been renewed with almost offensive emphasis since my previous article. The vast majority of those who repeat them verbatim in all quarters of the country have probably not the means of knowing whether the statements put into my mouth are correctly attributed to me or not, and do not I am sure suspect them to be so garbled as to be misleading. My complaint lies, then, not against the disciples who repeat, but against the originators of the misstatements, an example of which is set forth in the following words. Moreover, let me say that this quotation is one of the most widely circulated, which is another reason for dealing with it here. I give it, with its heading, copied from an original form.[1]

SIR HENRY THOMPSON'S VIEWS

'Is man designed to be a vegetable feeder, or a flesh-eating or an omnivorous animal? Any evidence to be found by anatomical investigation can only be safely regarded as showing what man is and has been. Thus the character of his teeth and digestive organs indicate that during his long history of development he has mainly lived on roots, seeds, nuts and fruits; in other words, he has been a vegetable feeder. For these organs are in all essential points identical with those possessed by the highest apes.

It is a vulgar error to regard meat in any form as a necessity of life.'

Let it be observed (1) that the two paragraphs are bracketed as a single quotation by inverted commas. There is no sign, none by intervening stars for example, to suggest a break in the context. Will it be believed that these two passages thus brought together as one do not occur in the same article, or even in the same volume?

[1] *Best Food for Athletes.* The Vegetarian Federal Union, Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, E.C. p. 11. The italics are the work of the quoter, not of the author.

The first is from the work entitled *Food and Feeding*.[2]

The second is from another work, *Diet in relation to Age, &c.*,[3] written some years later.

(2) That in each case the sense is entirely altered by the suppression of the immediate context.

Thus, the first extract is taken from the middle of a sentence, the commencement being left out. In the original it reads thus: '*I shall not enter on a discussion of the question*: Is man designed to be a vegetable feeder?' &c., as above. I have put the words in italics to mark the portion omitted.

I specially desired to show that, although in early stages of his development man was mainly a vegetable feeder, he had through later civilisation 'long been omnivorous,' a fact to be now beyond discussion, as the words which immediately follow in the text, but were also carefully suppressed, completely prove. I append them in italics:

'*During the stages of what is called civilisation, man has gradually extended his resources and has long been omnivorous to the extent which his experience and his circumstances have permitted.*'

No one could possibly infer my meaning unless I had here supplied the two missing passages. It will now be quite obvious that I declined to discuss the question whether man is a vegetable feeder or no, because during the later stages of civilisation he had 'long been an omnivorous' animal. The effect of my quoter's act in suppressing a few words before and after is therefore to represent 'my views' as exactly the opposite of those which the passage in its original condition expresses.

Now for the second short passage which terminates the 'quotation.'

It will be seen by reference that two pages of context immediately preceding this brief extact are occupied with details of advice, specially designed for elderly and sedentary persons with little power or opportunity of taking exercise, to live on well-made cereal food with fruits and vegetables, 'with a fair addition of eggs and milk if no meat is taken, and little of other animal food than fish. On such a dietary, and without alcoholic stimulants, thousands of such workers . . . . may enjoy far better health than at present they experience on meat or heavy puddings, beer, baker's bread, and cheese.' Then having briefly adverted to those who are less sedentary, I add: 'For such some corresponding modification of the dietary' —intending, of course, a little more animal food—'is naturally appropriate.' Desiring to discourage the use of meat by the sedentary I bring the subject to a close, commencing the paragraph with the words isolated by the quoter and placed by him in italics: 'But it

[2] *Food and Feeding*, 7th edition, pp. 18–21.

[3] *Diet in relation to Age and Activity*, top of p. 70.

is a vulgar error to regard meat in any form as necessary to life:'[4] Observe that the quoter stops at the colon without even ending the sentence, but substitutes a full stop, and again suppresses the context. This I will supply:

> If for any it is necessary, it is for the hard-working outdoor labourers above referred to, and for these a certain proportion is no doubt desirable. Animal flesh is useful as a concentrated form of nutriment, valuable for its portability, and for the small space it occupies in the stomach, unrivalled in certain circumstances. Like every other description of food, it is highly useful in its place, but is by no means necessary for a large proportion of the population.

It may be observed that all through the book on 'Diet' I have favoured as much as possible vegetarian views for the purpose of impressing the elderly or inactive consumers of much meat and fat, to whom the work is chiefly addressed, with the superior value of lighter food. For them it is truly a 'vulgar' error to consume the former, and for them alone was this said, as the context shows.

I am not disinclined to surmise that these grossly inaccurate representations may be greatly due to a certain torpor or obliquity of the moral sense, insensibly acquired through want of due respect for the meaning of words and a consequent loose habit in employing them—a condition too commonly occurring among those who, somewhat hastily perhaps, have become ardent advocates of peculiar views. And of this the employment of the word 'vegetarian' in a sense obviously misleading furnishes an ever present illustration. The sectarian, whether concerned with social habits or in that far greater field in which he is chiefly active—namely, the field of religious belief—is rarely a humble simple-minded seeker after truth. He does not patiently await what facts and study reveal, after the manner of a student of science, but approaches his subject with certain preconceived opinions for which he desires to gather support from authority, whether in the writings of experts or in the collection of 'scriptural texts.' No doubt the sectarian habit so predominant in this country—eliciting the sarcastic, but I fear just, observation from our keen-witted neighbours *outre mer* that we 'have a hundred religions although only one sauce'—is one of the innumerable forms of human egotism. This defect mostly appears in young and active minds without the training necessary to teach the risk of hastily generalising from insufficient or unproved data, and without a degree of experience attained by the habit of observation and by knowledge of life as manifested in the world and its surroundings. Some study of these furnishes a far more useful training to form a man's judgment than much which is taught in schools. They might

[4] Butcher's meat, or other flesh, of course, because I have immediately before been recommending them fish diet. I presume this has not yet been admitted into the 'vegetarian' scheme—to join the milk and eggs which its votaries say have so long been included.

find that the book of Nature itself presents 'context' as well as text; its students soon learn that patient search for all the truth, and not for isolated facts among the varied phenomena presented, is not only the worthiest pursuit for an intelligent mind, but furnishes breadth of view, and gives a due sense of the proportion of things. It would preserve many well-meaning people from the unconscious commission of really unpardonable errors. How very much modern faddism has its root in this confirmed and misleading practice! For those under its influence the assumption of personal singularity possesses strong attractions; it contributes a supposed distinction, confers a consciousness of superiority to their neighbours, and flatters their self-esteem.

Let me now briefly define my position in relation to vegetarianism to be distinctly this.

I have never been a vegetarian, and have never advised any one to become so; and this, notwithstanding that I have unhesitatingly stated that man may find in the vegetable kingdom the chemical elements necessary to support life. The healthy vitality of many persons may be so sustained, but, as a matter of fact, the very great majority of mankind add some product of the animal kingdom when they can obtain it. I have always deemed it unwise to reject any source of food well ascertained to agree with the human stomach, especially the flesh of animals, many forms of which are far more nutritious and more easily digested than are the corresponding nitrogenous products of the vegetable kingdom. So varied are man's idiosyncrasies, his occupations, whether bodily or mental, his surroundings, whether tropical, temperate, or northern, that it is impossible not to regard him, fitted as he is beyond all other creatures to adapt himself to life in every portion of the globe, as essentially an omnivorous animal. And this fact I hold now, as I have ever held and maintained, to be absolutely proved. The great majority of the human race are of necessity and must remain 'mixed feeders,' using animal food more or less in quantity according to the climate in which they live and the labour they perform. For this purpose their internal organs admirably serve. I have never in any part of my works stated that man in general can thrive without some animal food, whether it be in the form of milk, eggs, fish, birds, or the flesh of flocks and herds.

Any opinion contrary to this statement can only be deduced from writings of mine by quotations without context after the fallacious method illustrated above.

Having carefully read what purport to be replies to the article in question, I find that they chiefly consist in demands variously reiterated 'that I should withdraw' the passages quoted, or that I should 'specifically retract' them, otherwise vegetarians will be justified in reproducing them, being able to give 'chapter and verse as our warranty'! Again, the well worn trick of the text seeker! My answer to all this is complete in the foregoing paragraph, and I

have only to repeat that no impartial non-sectarian reader can do other than affirm that my works throughout sustain the necessity for man of a mixed, and not a restricted, diet, and the value of animal food. And of this I shall before closing demonstrate the increased and increasing importance under the augmenting stress of modern life.

But there is a single attempt to meet fairly one argument, which I beg leave to reply to. It is an answer to my statement that 'man is born into the world a consumer of animal food, and it is for the "vegetarian" to show cause for determining at what age, if at any, he should henceforth be compelled to restrict himself to a diet from the vegetable kingdom.' My opponent says frankly, and apparently with some triumphant emphasis, that I have said this, 'apparently quite forgetting that precisely the same argument applies to oxen and sheep, which he has called on a previous page "exclusively vegetable feeders," and that no vegetarian advice is required in their case.'

Indeed! is not the forgetfulness on his side? Does he forget—or did he never know—that the oxen and sheep being 'exclusively vegetable feeders' necessarily possess a special digestive apparatus destined for future use, when it and the teeth also are sufficiently developed? This does not take place until the end of the first period of life, during which they live entirely and grow rapidly on milk. Then the apparatus comes into use, consisting of four stomachs specially adapted for the digestion of vegetable food, while man has a single stomach,[5] and that adapted only for nitrogenous and not for the starches of cereal foods. He ought to be aware that the 'exclusively vegetable feeder' employs these stomachs for a singular process of digestion known as 'chewing the cud,' which is performed after all meals. Did he never see the herd, reposing after a long and slowly acquired meal of green stuff, lying quietly and happily on the grass, slowly rechewing the mouthfuls brought back from below in balls for the purpose, and afterwards returned into the first of his four stomachs, the paunch, thence to be transmitted in turn to the other stomachs for special treatment there? Is he not aware that the human child never having been provided with such an apparatus possesses a much simpler stomach, closely resembling that of the carnivore, being specially provided with a gastric juice to digest proteid materials, especially those derived from animals, and is wholly incapable of dealing with the food of the ruminating animals just named? For the human stomach cannot even digest bread and starches, which duty is accomplished by the chemical action of the saliva during mastication in the mouth. And should this have been imperfectly accomplished, as often happens, the digestion of the starchy matters is subsequently effected when these have passed the stomach, and meet the pancreatic juice in the first intestine.

Consequently the argument falls to the ground through the

[5] See p. 972.

existence of essential difference between the digestive organs of the two animals, the child of man and the young calf, at the end of their respective times of weaning.

No better illustration could have been given of this significant and important physiological fact: that the digestive apparatus of the animal must correspond to the extent of change which its food has to undergo in order to convert it into the flesh which constitutes the animal consuming it.

Thus if grass, which is very low in the scale of vegetable growths, has to be converted into the highly composite animal fibre constituting beef and mutton, a long and complicated apparatus is required—viz. that of the 'ruminants' above described. No human stomach under any circumstances has the power of effecting the changes in question.

The carnivore, living exclusively on flesh, requires for his purpose nothing more than the digestion and assimilation of animal tissues identical with those already composing his own body. This process compared with that above described is a very simple one; and accordingly the stomach and digestive organs are far less complex in structure.

Man holds a position between the two extremes, with his varied surroundings and his ability to select and adapt; for he possesses the power to support life by consuming the best products of the vegetable kingdom, and also all animal foods, suitable to his purpose and tastes. The animal fibres of fishes, birds, and tender meat, with the concentrated extracts of the latter, being identical in nature and form with the structures of his own body, are assimilated with far greater ease than the nitrogenous products of the vegetable kingdom. His digestive apparatus is more highly developed than that of the carnivore, but much more closely resembles it than the complicated apparatus of the exclusively vegetable feeder.

Man is therefore manifestly adapted for a mixed diet from the animal and vegetable kingdom, and must be regarded beyond all controversy as adapted for an omnivorous diet.

There is an important aspect of the subject which I desire to present here. It is that offered by a review of the extraordinary changes affecting man in every rank of life and his surroundings in all parts of the civilised world which have taken place during the last sixty years. I am old enough to have marked those changes with an observant eye both in the metropolis and in the country. It is difficult, perhaps impossible, for the present generation to realise the contrast presented in respect of the demand now made on man's activity, especially that of his brain, during, say, the last thirty or forty years with that which was required by the routine of life as it was in the 'thirties.' The wear and tear of existence has enormously increased, and the demand for rapid action and intense exertion by the nervous system is certainly tenfold greater now, to make a

moderate estimate, than it was then. A railway appeared in the first year of the decade named; the penny post and the electric telegraph not until its close; while the press, both daily and weekly, now gigantic, was then by comparison insignificant and diminutive. For the great majority even of business men life was tranquil and leisure plentiful, while competition was almost unknown; I need not attempt to describe what it is now. Such changes have naturally been the cause of permanent injury to many whose powers sufficed for the quiet time, but gave way in large and still increasing number under the inevitable struggle which issues in 'the survival of the fittest.'

The necessary result of this extreme demand for brain activity, since that organ is the sole source of energy on which all the functions of the body, including that of digestion, depend, is an insufficient supply for this important process. Among all others this inadequacy is perhaps the most common, and it certainly is the most disastrous. As with electrical supply, whether for light or motion, the capacity of the storage cells is limited; and when they are emptied we know that no more work is possible. So with man's store of energy, it must be fatal to his well-being and even to his existence, if digestion loses its due supply of nerve power, since digestion only can refill the storage cells.

Under these circumstances nothing can be more important than to provide food of a kind and in a form which will economise the work of the stomach. It must not be bulky; much of it may be advantageously soluble in form so as to be rapidly and easily assimilated, even pre-digested sometimes; and when solid not requiring much mastication. I have found nothing which fulfils these conditions so completely as the various concentrated extracts of meat which are now so extensively used. When well made they provide the maximum of nourishment with the minimum of demand for labour on the part of the nervous system. And it is worthy of note that several varieties of this form of animal food came into vogue during the middle third of the century, the remarkable demand for them seeming to augment *pari passu* with man's increased need for support. A happy and natural, although undesigned, relation exists between the two; and I do not hesitate to say that these animal extracts have saved many who might have otherwise fallen in the fray. A teaspoonful of sound beef extract in a breakfast cup of hot water when the brain is fatigued and the stomach unfit for work is often the best antidote possible, reinvigorates the system, and prepares it for a light meal or for a little more work as the case may be—a result far too frequently sought through the pernicious habit of obtaining temporary relief in a glass of wine or spirit.

Nothing approaching in value to well-made animal extracts can be obtained from any vegetable source of proteids. Nothing is derivable from the numerous leguminous seeds, whether beans, peas, or lentils—not even the 'green peas' specially suggested by one of

my critics—which is comparable with extract of meat.[6] I have tried the latest attempt to produce a vegetable extract to compete with those of beef, and I shall refrain from speaking of it further.

Let me just add that the last few years have perhaps somewhat increased my respect for the stomach of an omnivorous animal, and my gratitude for the possession of one. The pace at which we live increases and will inevitably continue to do so, and as inevitably the average brain will increase in capacity to do more work. If I foresee in this a greater demand for strong sustenance, I know well in which natural kingdom we must seek it; not so much, however, in the old form of solid joints which require much more expenditure to digest than the concentrated forms referred to. Also the choicest portions of lean meat may be very finely minced and reduced to a *purée*, in which condition they may be assimilated by the stomach with great facility.

Let me now before concluding remind my reader that three very important practical questions were formally propounded in the last paragraph of my first article, for which an adequate solution was required.

The first demanded if it would be prudent to provision a large ship, with full crew and passengers for a long voyage, solely on vegetarian diet? Or, secondly, thus to limit the supplies for an army corps sent abroad? Or, thirdly, those of an exploring party designed to investigate a remote and unknown region?

It is significant that at present I have seen no reply.

I also demonstrated that it was at least a fact worthy of serious consideration that the life enjoyed by all animals reared for food, whether in the poultry yards or in the fields, was after all a happy one; and that for no other animals is existence so easy or death so swift and painless. This undeniable statement was simply received with derision! For men who were before all things asserting their humane consideration for animal life, this was at least inconsistent and unseemly; while it failed altogether to meet the argument.

Lastly, I venture to advise my old friends the 'vegetarians,' as I sincerely believe for their advantage, to change their distinctive appellation. They emphatically state that they no longer rely for their diet on the produce of the vegetable kingdom, differing from those who originally adopted the name at a date by no means remote.[7] I give this merely to fix the period in relation to the name, and to what was assuredly then the practice of vegetarians.

[6] For further information respecting this indubitable fact, see the work below named, where it is carefully and impartially considered. The tabulated result is given of careful experiments made by Fr. Hofmann on the power of man's digestive organs to assimilate the nitrogenous elements (albumen) from animal and vegetable sources respectively. From the data supplied it appears that while four-fifths of the albumen consumed from animal sources are digested (81 parts in the 100), not quite half (46·6 in the 100) is digested of albumen derived from vegetable sources, cereals, legumes, &c.

Food in Health and Disease, by I. Burney Yeo, M.D., F.R.C.P., Phys. to King's College Hospital, &c., &c. (Cassell, 1896), p. 148 *et seq.*

[7] Dr. Latham's *Dictionary of the English Language*, founded on Johnson, 4 vols.,

Since that time, and I venture to think very wisely, they have added to their diet some important and nutritious products from the animal kingdom. But they have still drawn a hard and fast line short of using any part of an animal, whether it be fish, fowl, sheep, or ox, in their dietary. Hence they have become simply 'flesh abstainers,' a term which logically and honestly describes their position. But still more recently I have been specifically desired in several quarters to observe as an important fact that a new derivation for the word 'vegetarian' is proposed. And on very high authority I learn that the suggestion is an acceptable one, and further that 'they' (the vegetarians) 'believed in the highest form of life and the highest possibilities for humanity. Such being so, they were not in the category spoken of. Vegetarianism had nothing to do with vegetable eating. It had to do with bringing human nature into greater vitality to a higher position, and to greater strength of body, mind, and soul. Because they believed that eating animals was antagonistic to the higher life, they were vegetarians, not vegetable eaters.' [8]

I think that many, if not all, will in time agree with me that with this readiness to repudiate vegetable food, associated as it is with a tendency to cultivate wider aims and views, a gradual further enlargement of the dietary may happily result. For I observe that the term 'vegetarian' is evidently becoming embarrassing to not a few members of the society, as a misleading and inaccurate distinctive appellation is sure to be. But 'flesh abstainers,' with views thus clearly defined, might possibly not feel bound to deny themselves some moderate use of fish, which would be a valuable addition, since it is commonly regarded as the antithesis of flesh in relation to its dietetic tendencies, &c. Hence its large employment in Catholic countries in place of flesh on all fast-days, as the chief

4to, Longmans, 1870, thus defines 'vegetarian; one who, abstaining from animal food, feeds exclusively on the products of the vegetable kingdom.'

[8] Presidential Address, *The Vegetarian*, the 30th of April, 1898.—When my attention was first called to the recent discovery (!) that the Latin word 'vegeto, to arouse or enliven,' having no relation in that language with vegetable life or food, was the root from which the word 'vegetarian' was originally derived, I naturally regarded it as a mere pleasantry. All the world knew what the meaning of the word had been, and that for years it had designated the eating of vegetable food and nothing else (*vide* note No. 7). If really compelled to take the statement seriously, let me ask what then is the meaning of the emphatic assertions prolonged and reiterated through all the years that are past—of the endless quotations from authority—that the vegetable kingdom contains all the dietetic elements necessary to support a healthy human life? Surely this prime article of faith has been the central and unique cause for the existence of the 'Vegetarian Society.' Is it not a little late in the day to shift its present well-earned and well-understood position thus? Both derivations cannot be sustained. Either uphold, as you always have done, the all sufficiency of the vegetable kingdom for man's food, or say at once that you have renounced this doctrine, for 'vegetarian' has, by virtue of the recent discovery, assumed a totally new and unsuspected significance—viz. 'the bringing of human nature into greater vitality, &c.' I still hesitate to regard the passage as more than rhetorical ornament, and have therefore relegated these remarks to a foot note.

element of a *maigre* diet. Again, if they only knew how valuable the more or less fluid extracts of meat already referred to are in certain exceptional conditions of great prostration, mental or physical, they ought not to be absolutely compelled to reject them, at least when their use is enforced by medical advice.

I now take leave of the subject. For the great body of the Vegetarian Society throughout our country I cherish, as heretofore, feelings of sympathy and respect for their attachment to a simple diet, and humane consideration for animal life, so abundantly existing everywhere. For the few, as I hope and in charity believe them to be, who have perverted my meaning and misrepresented my views, I cannot altogether regret the opportunity they have afforded me of exposing the tactics of the sectarian who, whether he be only narrow-minded or unscrupulous, exercises a mischievous influence always and wherever he is found.

HENRY THOMPSON.

P.S.—Since this article went to press I have seen a prominent reference (*Vegetarian*, 14th of May) to a statement of mine made in 1879—that the value of the product of an acre of land cropped with cereals and legumes would support a much larger population than an acre of pasturage devoted to cattle-feeding. My critic omits the context which immediately follows—being one of the reasons given for the extra value referred to—namely, that 'the corn-land will produce, almost without extra cost, a considerable quantity of animal food in the form of pigs and poultry, from the offal or coarser parts of vegetable produce, which is unsuitable for human consumption.'

But the two paragraphs of 1898 from my recent article, quoted for comparison, differ mainly because in 1879 I held the belief, then generally accepted, that proteid elements obtained *by chemical analysis* from legumes might be regarded as equal in nutritious value to those obtained by digestion in man's stomach from beef and mutton. Carefully conducted experiments since made prove that the leguminous proteids do not yield to the human stomach anything like the amount of nutritive matter which the animal proteids impart. Thus, also, the consumer might well 'feel lighter' after his dish of legumes than after meat, because only a bare moiety of the nutritive matter in the former case is taken up into the system. Hence the statement of nearly twenty years ago, like many others in the progress of research for truth, is found untenable to-day. And thus it is, or should be, that as we grow older we grow wiser. If our opinions are not modified with the progress of the age, we are learning nothing, and 'have lived to very little purpose,' a maxim I have thus often had occasion to enforce in the course of my professional teaching at University College.[9]

[9] See *Clinical Lectures*, eighth edition, p. 55; Churchill, London, 1888.

'Splendid Isolation,' or What? By H. M. Stanley,
IN THIS NUMBER.

This is the Original Edition Printed in England and issued in America by authority of the English Publishers.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

A MONTHLY REVIEW

EDITED BY JAMES KNOWLES

No. 256, JUNE, 1898.

I. 'Splendid Isolation,' or What? By Henry M. Stanley, M.P.
II. Our Urgent Need of a Reserve of Wheat. By R. B. Marston (*With a Plan*)
III. Lord Salisbury's Score in China. By Holt S. Hallett.
IV. The Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897. By R. T. Thomson.
V. The Difficulties and the Limits of Co-operation. By the Right Hon. Lord Brassey.
VI. On Style in English Prose, By Frederic Harrison.
VII. Breach of Church Law: its Danger and its Remedy. By the Right Rev. Bishop Barry.
VIII. The Catholicism of the British Army. By Captain Philip Trevor.
IX. 'Why Vegetarian?'—a Reply to Critics. By Sir Henry Thompson, F.R.C.S.
X. Wanted—an Opera. By J. A. Fuller Maitland.
XI. Death and Torture under Chloroform. By Mrs. R. M. King.
XII. The Microbe in Agriculture. By C. M. Aikman, D.Sc.
XIII. The First Woman's Hospital in Morocco. By the Countess of Meath.
XIV. Fighting the Bubonic Plague in India. By Miss Marion Hunter, (*late Plague Medical Officer, Poona*).
XV. Among the Elephants. By J. D. Rees, C.I.E.
XVI. The Fine-Art of Living. By Sir Martin Conway.
XVII. Mr. Gladstone as a Contributor to the 'Nineteenth Century.' By the Editor.

NEW YORK:
LEONARD SCOTT PUBLICATION COMPANY,
112 WALL STREET.

PUBLISHERS OF
CONTEMPORARY REVIEW. NINETEENTH CENTURY. FORTNIGHTLY REVIEW.
BLACKWOOD'S EDINBURGH MAGAZINE.
EDINBURGH, QUARTERLY, AND SCOTTISH REVIEWS.
WESTMINSTER REVIEW. SHAKESPEARIANA.

$4.50 per Annum. **Single Copy 40 Cents.**

Registered at New York Post Office as Second-Class Matter.

LONDON: SAMPSON LOW, MARSTON & COMPANY, Limited.

Mr. Gladstone as a Contributor to the 'Nineteenth Century'
IN THIS NUMBER.



SPRING TRIPS!

Clyde Line Excursions,

Including Meals and Accommodations,

NEW YORK TO

Charleston, S. C.,

AND RETURN,

INTERMEDIATE ROUND TRIP, $24.00.

FIRST CLASS ROUND TRIP, $32.00.

NEW YORK TO

FLORIDA

AND RETURN,

INTERMEDIATE ROUND TRIP, $35.30.

FIRST CLASS ROUND TRIP, $43.30.

$3.75 additional includes round trip transportation on the beautiful

ST. JOHN'S RIVER.

For full particulars see your nearest ticket agent, or write to

Passenger Department:

201 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.
12 So Delaware Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.
5 Bowling Green, New York.

T. G. EGER, Traffic Manager.

WM. P. CLYDE & CO., General Agents.

Two Valuable Papers on Organized Activity

Institute Organization: the Plan and Scope of the Brooklyn Institute and its application to other cities.

—BY—

BARR FERREE,

President of the Department of Architecture of the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences; Secretary of the National Sculpture Society, etc.

The Popular Lecture as an Educator. Reprinted from *Education*. By the same author.

Price, 25 cents each.

Leonard Scott Publication Co.,

112 Wall Street, New York.

PROVIDENT LIFE AND TRUST CO.

OF PHILADELPHIA.

ATTENTION is directed to the new Instalment-Annuity Policy of the Provident which provides a fixed income for twenty years, and for the continuance of the income to the widow for the balance of her life, if she should survive the instalment period of twenty years.

In everything that makes Life Insurance perfectly safe and moderate in cost, and in liberality to policy-holders, the Provident is unsurpassed.

Permission to reprint entire Articles from this Review is witheld.